

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/575,290
Amndt. Dated May 2, 2005
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 12/02/2004
Page 2 of 7

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1 and 7. In Figs. 1 and 7, an "address" has been added to the information provider's server.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets
Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/575,290
Amdt. Dated May 2, 2005
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 12/02/2004
Page 3 of 7

REMARKS

Claims 9-12 are pending in this application. The Examiner objected to the drawings and rejected Claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Figs. 1 and 7 have been amended in the foregoing amendment.

Objection to Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In particular, the Examiner indicated that the address information must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claims. Applicants amended Figs. 1 and 7 such that the information provider's server includes an "address." Page 6, lines 20-21 of the specification describes that "a unique address on the computer network 1 is given to the information provider's server 15," and thus, the amendment does not include any new matter.

Geiger and De Boor Do Not Teach or Suggest the Inventions of Claims 9-12

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,463,534 to Geiger et al. ("Geiger") in view of WO 99/59283 to De Boor et al. ("De Boor"). Applicants traverse this rejection for the reasons discussed below.

Claim 9

The service providing system as defined in Claim 9 requires, among other elements, that the authentication server has a transmitter which sends to the portable terminal the requested information sent by the information providing server and the authentication information retrieved from the authentication database when the address information and the tag information match the stored authentication information, and the portable terminal having a first display area which displays the requested information sent by the information providing server and a second display area which displays the authentication information.

The Examiner admitted that Geiger fails to explicitly teach a second display area which displays the authentication information. However, the Examiner contended that the

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/575,290
Amdt. Dated May 2, 2005
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 12/02/2004
Page 4 of 7

use and advantages for using such a display are well known to one skilled in the art, as evidenced by the teachings of De Boor.

De Boor describes a status bar 200 which displays signal strength 202, battery strength 204, and message-waiting indicator 206 (Page 9, lines 3-27, and Figs. 2 and 5). Although De Boor does not explicitly describe how this information is obtained, normally such information is obtained from the device itself. The information displayed in the status bar 200 is not authentication information retrieved from the authentication database when the address information and the tag information match the stored authentication information, as required by Claim 9.

De Boor describes that an advertisement such as shown in Fig. 5 is displayed after being authenticated (e.g. Claim 6). In De Boor, a key 312 is used to authenticate an advertisement file 320 that is received so that only authorized advertisement files are included in the advertisement file store. See Fig. 3 and page 12, lines 19-22. In particular, De Boor describes at page 29, lines 15-24 and in Fig. 8, step 801 and 802, that a datagram is authenticated by applying the MD5 algorithm, and when the signature does not match, such unauthorized advertisements are not introduced into the wireless communication device. The authentication described in De Boor does not use address information and tag information, as required by Claim 9. Moreover, in De Boor, what is displayed as a result of the authentication is the advertisement information itself. No authentication information is displayed. The purpose of De Boor's invention is to provide integrated advertising capabilities to a wireless communication device. In De Boor, only the authenticated advertisement is displayed. It is not necessary or reasonable for the invention of De Boor to assign a second display area for displaying authentication information. De Boor does not describe retrieving authentication information when the address information and the tag information match the stored authentication information, and displaying the authentication information in the second display, as required by Claim 9.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/575,290
Amdt. Dated May 2, 2005
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 12/02/2004
Page 5 of 7

Accordingly, Claim 9 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from the cited references at the time Applicants made the claimed invention, and Claim 9 should be allowed.

Claim 11

The service providing method as defined in Claim 11 requires, among other elements, that the authentication server converting the received tag information to authentication information displayable on the portable terminal when the received address information and tag information match the stored address information and stored tag information, and sending the requested information sent by the information providing server and the authentication information to the portable terminal; and the portable terminal displaying the requested information on a first display area and the authentication information on a second display area and the authentication server determining whether the address information and tag information match information stored in the authentication server.

For similar reasons as discussed above in relation with Claim 9, the invention as defined in Claim 11 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from the cited references at the time Applicants made the claimed invention. Accordingly, Claim 11 should also be allowed.

Claims 10 and 12

Claims 10 and 12 depend from independent Claims 9 and 11 respectively. The remarks made above in support of the independent claims are equally applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from the cited references.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/575,290
Amdt. Dated May 2, 2005
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 12/02/2004
Page 6 of 7

Kay, Katz, Talati, Hiroya, Ramasubramani, Hultgren
and Valtanen Do Not Show or Suggest the Invention of Claims 9-12

The Examiner requested Applicants to consider Kay, Katz, Talati, Hiroya, Ramasubramani, Hultgren and Valtanen for relevant teachings when responding to the Office Action. Applicants have considered the teachings of these references and submit that none of the references describe that the authentication server has a transmitter which sends to the portable terminal the requested information sent by the information providing server and the authentication information retrieved from the authentication database when the address information and the tag information match the stored authentication information, and the portable terminal having a first display area which displays the requested information sent by the information providing server and a second display area which displays the authentication information, as required by Claim 9.

Moreover, none of the references describe that the authentication server converts the received tag information to authentication information displayable on the portable terminal when the received address information and tag information match the stored address information and stored tag information, and sends the requested information sent by the information providing server and the authentication information to the portable terminal; and the portable terminal displaying the requested information on a first display area and the authentication information on a second display area and the authentication server determining whether the address information and tag information match information stored in the authentication server, as required by Claim 11.

Claims 10 and 12 depend from independent Claims 9 and 11 respectively.


Accordingly, the invention of Claims 9-12 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill from Kay, Katz, Talati, Hiroya, Ramasubramani, Hultgren and Valtanen at the time Applicants made the claimed invention, and Claims 9-12 should be allowed.

Appln. No. Serial No. 09/575,290
Amdt. Dated May 2, 2005
Third Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 12/02/2004
Page 7 of 7

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicant solicits a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Our Docket: 44471-234039 (13700-0235)